

App. No. 09/804,492  
Office Action Dated April 5, 2005  
Page 7

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 22 are hereby amended.

The amendment of claims 1 and 22, reciting "aligned in a substantially same direction as a pit-row direction or a guide groove direction, wherein the pit-row direction and the guide groove direction are both aligned along a tangential direction in the optical information recording medium", is supported, for example, by Figure 10.

Claims 1-11 and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Ohyama (US 6,512,608). Applicants traverse this rejection. Ohyama does not disclose an optical head device wherein the plurality of semiconductor lasers are disposed so that beam spots, formed on the optical information recording medium, of light beams emitted from the plurality of semiconductor lasers are aligned in a substantially same direction as a pit-row direction or a guide groove direction, wherein the pit-row direction and the guide groove direction are both aligned along a tangential direction in the optical information recording medium, as required by claim 1. The Examiner contends that beam spots B0, B1, and B2 (of Figure 14) are equivalent to the claimed beam spots. The applicants respectfully traverse this view. B0, B1, and B2 all result from the same light source. B0 is the main beam and B1 and B2 are side beams (see column 19, line 66 to column 20, line 1). Ohyama teaches that branching beam 1d is provided from the first light source (25) and branching beam 1c is provided from the second light source (27). See Figure 15. Subsequently, a 3-beam generating diffraction grating (28) divides each of the branching beams (1c and 1d) into one main beam (B0) and two side beams (B1 and B2). As can be seen by Figure 15, the branching beams (1c and 1d) are displaced from each other by a distance d, in a radial direction. Therefore, the resulting set of beams (B0-B2) resulting from the first light source (25) are displaced radially from the set of beams (B0-B2) resulting from the second light source (27).

In contrast, the claimed optical head device includes two light beams that provide beam spots 14 to 16 that are substantially are aligned along a pit-row (see page 11, lines 3-6 and Figure

App. No. 09/804,492  
Office Action Dated April 5, 2005  
Page 8

10). The claimed alignment allows a stable tracking operation to be carried out (see page 13, lines 1-7). Since Ohyama does not teach or suggest such an alignment, one knowledgeable in the art would not look to the reference to teach the current invention. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-11 and 19 is requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 15, 19, and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo (US 5,963,515) in view of Funato (US 6,072,579). Applicants traverse this rejection. The combination of Shindo and Funato does not suggest an optical head device including wherein the plurality of semiconductor lasers are disposed so that beam spots, formed on the optical information recording medium, of light beams emitted from the plurality of semiconductor lasers are aligned in a substantially same direction as a pit-row direction or a guide groove direction, wherein the pit-row direction and the guide groove direction are both aligned along a tangential direction in the optical information recording medium, as required by claims 1 and 22. Shindo teaches only one light source emitting a beam at a time, and therefore does not teach beam spots from multiple beams being aligned as claimed. Shindo teaches either the first laser diode (32) being turned on while the second laser diode (33) is turned off, or vice versa (33 on while 32 is off). See column 14, lines 32-54. Figure 7B of Shindo does not teach alignment of beam spots resulting from a plurality of lasers, as required by claims 1 and 22. Rather, Figure 7B shows a main spot (MB) and four side spots ( $S_{B1}$ - $S_{B4}$ ) that result from one laser diode being turned on and being converted into five light beams by a grating (13). See Figure 7.

As conceded by the Examiner, Funato only teaches multiple light sources provided on one substrate. Therefore, one would not look to the combination of Shindo and Funato to teach the claimed optical head device. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-4, 6-11, 15, 19, and 22 is requested.

Claims 5 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Funato, and further in view of Uchizaki (US 6,646,975). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claims 5 and 14 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which they depend. Uchizaki does not remedy the deficiencies of Shindo and Funato, as previously noted.

App. No. 09/804,492  
Office Action Dated April 5, 2005  
Page 9

Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claims. Favorable reconsideration of claims 5 and 14 is requested.

Claim 12 was rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Funato, and further in view of Takeda (US 6,489,599). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 12 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Takeda does not remedy the deficiencies of Shindo and Funato, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claim. Favorable reconsideration of claim 12 is requested.

Claim 13 was rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Funato, and further in view of Tanabe (US 6,118,586). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 13 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Tanabe does not remedy the deficiencies of Shindo and Funato, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claim. Favorable reconsideration of claim 13 is requested.

Claim 18 was rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Funato, and further in view of Ootaki (US 5,734,637). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 18 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Ootaki does not remedy the deficiencies of Shindo and Funato, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claim. Favorable reconsideration of claim 18 is requested.

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo in view of Funato, and further in view of Kajiyama (US 6,552,990). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claims 20 and 21 should be reconsidered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which they depend. Kajiyama does not remedy the deficiencies of Shindo and Funato, as previously noted. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claims. Favorable reconsideration of claims 20 and 21 is requested.

App. No. 09/804,492  
Office Action Dated April 5, 2005  
Page 10

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Dated: July 5, 2005



DPM:mfe

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Mueller", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No.: 30,300  
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.  
225 South Sixth Street  
Suite 2650  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612.455.3800